

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 7-9 are all the claims pending in the application.

Applicants have incorporated the “prepared in a reversed micelle” subject matter from original Claim 7 into Claim 1.

No new matter has been added.

I. CLAIM FOR FOREIGN PRIORITY

In the Amendment filed July 21, 2006, Applicants pointed out that the examiner has not acknowledged applicants' claim for foreign priority. Applicants requested the examiner to make such an acknowledgement.

Referring to the third paragraph under the heading “Response to Arguments” at the top of page 2 of the final Office Action, the examiner states that she did not find any foreign priority documents in this case. Therefore, the examiner states that foreign priority will not be acknowledged.

Applicants direct the examiner’s attention to MPEP §201.14(b)(II), and point out that, where the benefit of a foreign filing date based on a foreign application is claimed in a later-filed application (e.g., a divisional application), and a certified copy of the foreign application as filed, has been filed in the parent application, it is not necessary to file an additional certified copy in the later application.

The present application is a divisional application of U.S. 10/231,290, and the examiner was advised that the priority document was filed in the ‘290 application by the new application transmittal letter filed March 2, 2004.

Applicants repeat their request to acknowledge the claim for foreign priority in the next communication to Applicants.

II. INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT (IDS) FILED MARCH 2, 2004

In the Amendment filed July 21, 2006, Applicants pointed out that the examiner has not initialed any of the foreign patent documents or non-patent literature documents that are listed on the Substitute Form PTO 1449 filed with the IDS of March 2, 2004. Applicants requested the examiner to initial these documents since they were properly cited in the IDS.

Referring to the fourth paragraph under the heading “Response to Arguments” at the top of page 2 of the final Office Action, the examiner states that applicant has not provided the relevant documents to the examiner. Therefore, the examiner states that they were crossed out on the IDS.

It was wrong to not initial any of the foreign patent documents or non-patent literature documents that are listed on the Substitute Form PTO 1449 filed with the IDS of March 2, 2004. An IDS was filed on March 2, 2004, in order to make of record in the present application the references of record in parent application 10/231,290. Applicants direct the examiner’s attention to MPEP §609.04(a)(II), and point out that copies of the patents and publications submitted in parent application 10/231,290 need not be resubmitted in the present application.

Applicants repeat their request to initial these documents since they were properly cited in the IDS.

III. RESPONSE TO REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Referring to page 3 of the final Office Action, Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 59-76921 (“Komatsu”).

Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 is an independent claim. It is directed to a method for producing a fine carbon fiber. The method of Claim 1 includes preparing fine particles of a catalyst in a reversed micelle.

Komatsu does not teach or suggest a method that includes preparing fine particles of a catalyst in a reversed micelle. Thus, Komatsu does not teach or suggest each and every recitation of Claim 1.

Claim 7 depends from Claim 1 and is not rendered obvious by Komatsu, at least by virtue of its dependency.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the present §103 rejection is requested.

IV. RESPONSE TO REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Referring to page 4 of the final Office Action, Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komatsu in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,759,693 (“Vogeli”).

Applicants respectfully traverse.

As stated at Section III above, Komatsu does not teach or suggest a method that includes preparing fine particles of a catalyst in a reversed micelle. Vogeli does not cure this deficiency of Komatsu. Thus, the combination of Komatsu and Vogeli does not teach or suggest each and every recitation of Claim 1.

Claim 2 depends from Claim 1 and is not rendered obvious by the combination of Komatsu and Vogeli, at least by virtue of its dependency.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the present §103 rejection is requested.

V. RESPONSE TO REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Referring to pages 4 and 5 of the final Office Action, Claims 2-4 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komatsu in further view of JP 2-6617 (“Murata”).

Applicants respectfully traverse.

As stated at Section III above, Komatsu does not teach or suggest a method that includes preparing fine particles of a catalyst in a reversed micelle. Murata does not cure this deficiency of Komatsu. Thus, the combination of Komatsu and Murata does not teach or suggest each and every recitation of Claim 1.

Each of Claims 2-4 and 8-9 depends from Claim 1 and is not rendered obvious by the combination of Komatsu and Murata, at least by virtue of its dependency.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the present §103 rejection is requested.

VI. CONCLUSION

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

/L. Raul Tamayo/
L. Raul Tamayo
Registration No. 47,125

Date: January 18, 2007